

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed March 9, 2005, has been received and reviewed. Claims 51 through 68 are currently pending in the application. Claims 61 through 68 are allowed. Claims 51 through 60 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 51, 52, 55, and 57, has added new claims 69 through 75 (which contain identical subject matter from previously pending claims), and respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended herein.

Information Disclosure Statement(s)

Applicants note the filing of an Information Disclosure Statement herein on August 20, 2003 and note that no copy of the PTO-1449 was returned with the outstanding Office Action. Applicants respectfully request that the information cited on the PTO-1449 (which is the same as that of record to that date in the parent application hereto) be made of record herein.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 51 and 54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,635,268. Claims 55, 56, and 60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 2, and 4 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,395,292. Although applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 51 and 55 have been amended. Claims 54, 56, and 60 now depend from amended claims 51 and 55. As such, Applicants believe the rejections have been overcome.

Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,635,268

Claims 51 through 53 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,635,268. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

Double Patenting Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 6,395,292

Claims 55 and 57 through 59 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,395,292. In order to avoid further expenses and time delay, Applicants elect to expedite the prosecution of the present application by filing a terminal disclaimer to obviate the double patenting rejections in compliance with 37 CFR §1.321 (b) and (c). Applicants' filing of the terminal disclaimer should not be construed as acquiescence in the Examiner's double patenting or obviousness-type double patenting rejections. Attached are the terminal disclaimer and accompanying fee.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS / NEW CLAIMS

The amendments to claims 51, 52, 55, and 57, and the addition of claims 69 through 75 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application.

CONCLUSION

Claims 51-75 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Edgar R. Cataxinos
Registration No. 39,931
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: June 9, 2005
ERC/ps:dn

Encls. Terminal Disclaimers (2)

Document in ProLaw